

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

RAUL A. MURIEL-MORALES,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants.

CV. NO. 06-2007(PG)
RE: CRIM. NO. 00-333

OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is plaintiff's "Motion for Reconsideration". (Docket No. 17).

A motion for reconsideration is treated as a motion under Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rosario Rivera v. PS Group of P.R., Inc., 186 F. Supp. 2d 63, 65 (D.P.R. 2002). See generally Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) ("Any motion to alter or amend a judgment shall be filed no later than 10 days after entry of judgment.") (emphasis supplied). These motions should be granted to correct "manifest errors of law" or to present newly discovered evidence. F.D.I.C. v. World Univ. Inc., 978 F.2d 10, 16 (1st Cir. 1992); Nat'l Metal Finishing Co. v. Barclaysamerican/Commercial, Inc., 899 F.2d 119, 123 (1st Cir. 1990). Rule 59(e) motions cannot be used "to raise arguments which could have been raised prior to the issuance of the judgment." Pac. Ins. Co. v. Am. Nat'l. Fire Ins. Co., 148 F.3d 396, 403 (4th Cir. 1998). Neither are Rule 59(e) motions appropriate "to repeat old arguments previously considered and rejected." Nat'l Metal Finishing Co., 899 F.2d at 123; accord Berrios-Berrios v. Commonwealth of P.R., 205 F. Supp. 2d 1, 2 (D.P.R. 2002); Colon v. Fraticelli, 181 F. Supp. 2d 48, 49 (D.P.R. 2002). For these reasons, motions for reconsideration are "extraordinary remedies which should be used sparingly," Nat'l Metal Finishing Co., 899 F.2d at 123, and are "typically denied," 8 Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 2810.1, at 128 (2d ed. 1995).

Here, plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration does not bring forth any new evidence, nor does it raise manifest errors or novel theories of law that would warrant reconsideration of the Court's February 26, 2007 order denying the motion to vacate. Accordingly, and having reviewed the record, the Motion for Reconsideration is hereby **DENIED**. (Docket No. 17.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 8, 2007.

S/JUAN M. PEREZ-GIMENEZ
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE